



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,069	01/29/2002	Alejandro Abuin	LEX-0305-USA	6633

24231 7590 04/15/2003
LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED
8800 TECHNOLOGY FOREST PLACE
THE WOODLANDS, TX 77381-1160

EXAMINER

STRZELECKA, TERESA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/060,069

Applicant(s)

ABUIN ET AL.

Examiner

Teresa E Strzelecka

Art Unit

1637

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____ .
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ .
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Each Group detailed below reads on patentably distinct Groups drawn to multiple SEQ ID Numbers. The sequences are patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences, and a further restriction is applied to each Group. For an elected Group drawn to amino acid or nucleic acid sequences, the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid or a single nucleic acid sequence (See MPEP 803.04).
2. It is noted that the restriction Groups are set forth as Groups I-V for convenience. However, each restriction Group actually comprises the numbers of Groups which read on each patentably distinct nucleic acid, polypeptide or antibody specificity.

Election/Restrictions

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1 and 2, drawn to an isolated polynucleotide comprising at least 60 nucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1-1,206, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1, for example.
 - II. Claims 3-6, drawn to a process for producing an isolated polynucleotide comprising hybridization of a probe to a template, classified in class 435, subclass 6, for example.
 - III. Claim 7, drawn to a process for identifying novel polynucleotide sequences by comparing sequences of polynucleotides with SEQ ID NO 1-1,206 with a test polynucleotide sequence, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1, for example.
 - IV. Claim 8, drawn to an isolated murine stem cell line comprising a mutation in at least one gene comprising a polynucleotides with SEQ ID NO 1-1,206, classified in class 435, subclass 325, for example.

Art Unit: 1637

- V. Claim 9, drawn to a method of generating a high affinity antibody to a human protein, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

4. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the polynucleotides of Group I can be made using an entirely different process, such as PCR amplification.
5. Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process of Group III can be practiced with entirely different sequences, rather than with the polynucleotide sequences Group I.
6. Inventions I and IV are separate and distinct, as the claims of Group I are drawn to polynucleotides, while the claim of Group IV is drawn to isolated embryonic stem cells. These are differing biochemical entities having differing biochemical properties, structures and effects. Group IV would require searching in areas unrelated to polynucleotides, and as such, would require an undue burden on the examiner if not restricted.
7. Inventions I and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant

Art Unit: 1637

case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polynucleotides of Group I is not required for the method of Group V.

8. Inventions II and (III, V) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to methods which have different method steps, starting materials and goals.

9. Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the stem cells of Group IV are not required for the method of Group II.

10. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the stem cells of Group IV are not required for the method of Group III.

11. Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to methods which have different method steps, starting materials and goals.

Art Unit: 1637

12. Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the stem cells of Group IV are not required for the method of Group V.

13. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

14. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

15. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Teresa E Strzelecka whose telephone number is (703) 306-5877. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1637

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

April 14, 2003

Teresa Strzelecka, Ph. D.

Patent Examiner

Teresa Strzelecka
4/14/03